



---

Robertson PA, Roy S, Mill AC, Shirley M, Adriaens T, Ward AI, Tatayah V, Booy O. [Invasive species removals and scale – contrasting island and mainland experience](#). *In: Island Invasives: Scaling up to Meet the Challenge*. 2017, Dundee, UK: IUCN.

**Copyright:**

This is the author's manuscript of a paper that was presented at Island Invasives: Scaling up to Meet the Challenge, held 10<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> July 2017 in Dundee, UK.

**Link to Conference:**

<https://www.dundee.ac.uk/events/2017/17-07-10-island-invasives-conference.php>

**Date deposited:**

13/02/2018



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License](#)

# Invasive species removals and scale – contrasting island and mainland experience

P.A. Robertson<sup>1</sup>, S. Roy<sup>2</sup>, A.C. Mill<sup>1</sup>, M. Shirley<sup>1</sup>, T. Adriaens<sup>3</sup>, A.I. Ward<sup>4</sup>, V. Tatayah<sup>5</sup> and O. Booy<sup>1,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Wildlife Management, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4DD, UK. < peter.robertson@ncl.ac.uk> <sup>2</sup>International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Gland, Switzerland. <sup>3</sup>Research Inst. for Nature and Forest (INBO), Department of Management and Sustainable Use, Kliniekstraat 25, B-1070 Brussels, Belgium. <sup>4</sup>School of Biological, Biomedical and Environmental Sciences, The University of Hull, HU6 7RX, UK. <sup>5</sup>Mauritian Wildlife Foundation, Grannum Road, Vacoas 73418, Mauritius. <sup>6</sup>Animal and Plant Health Agency, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1JW, UK.

## Abstract

Recent years have seen large increases in the number and size of successful invasive species eradications from islands. There is also a long history of large scale removals on larger land-masses. These programmes for mammals and terrestrial plants follow the same cost-area relationship although spanning 10 orders of magnitude in scale. Eradication can be readily defined in island situations, but can be more complex on larger land-masses where uncertainties defining the extent of a population, multiple population centres on the same land-mass and ongoing risks of immigration are commonplace. The term ‘complete removal’ is proposed to describe removal from an area with ongoing effort to maintain the area as clear, as features in many larger scale mainland programmes. Examples of complete removal to a boundary, in patches and in habitat islands are discussed. While island eradications continue to grow in scale, new legislation such as the lists of Species of European Union Concern will also drive increasing management on larger land-masses. However, these lists include large numbers of species that are already widespread. Methods are needed to prioritise species to reflect both the risks posed and the feasibility of management, including the effects of scale on cost and effectiveness.

Keywords: Eradication, control, non-native species, invasive alien species,

### 33 **Removal at Scale – islands and mainland experience.**

34 Recent years have seen a large increase in successful invasive species eradication projects from  
 35 islands, as well as significant increases in the size of islands involved. The number of  
 36 successful eradications continues to increase, and in 2012 the Database of Invasive Species  
 37 Eradications (<http://diise.islandconservation.org>) recorded 1,182 whole-island introduced  
 38 invasive species eradication projects either completed or underway on 762 individual islands.  
 39 In terms of scale, recent years have seen a number of large island eradications. Cruz, et al.  
 40 (2009) describe the eradication of goats from the 584 km<sup>2</sup> Santiago Island in Galapagos;  
 41 Parkes, et al. (2014) predicted the effort required to remove cats from the 1,680 km<sup>2</sup> Stewart  
 42 Island off New Zealand, while the current rat removal on South Georgia will cover 3,538 km<sup>2</sup>  
 43 (Piertney, 2016).

44 While the point at which an island becomes a mainland is arbitrary, there is also a long  
 45 history of invasive mammal removals from larger land masses in Northern Europe  
 46 (Robertson, et al., 2017). These include muskrat (*Ondatra zibethicus*, L.) eradications from  
 47 the mainlands of Britain and Ireland in the 1930s; the eradication of the Himalayan porcupine  
 48 (*Hystrix brachyura*, L.) (1970s) and coypu (*Myocaster coypus*, Molina) (1980s) from the  
 49 British mainland; a variety of American mink (*Neovison vison*, Schreber) and grey squirrel  
 50 (*Sciurus carolinensis*, Gmelin) removals from the larger British islands together with the  
 51 removal of Pallas' squirrel (*Callosciurus erythraeus*, Pallas) from Flanders on the European  
 52 mainland (since 2000). Few of the programmes covered more than a fraction of the total land  
 53 mass, so size was defined as the area over which species sightings occurred and trapping took  
 54 place. The larger of these species programmes have covered areas of 3,411 km<sup>2</sup> (the two  
 55 phases of the Hebridean mink programme), 5,219 km<sup>2</sup> (the five separate muskrat  
 56 eradications) and 19,210 km<sup>2</sup> (coypu) (details and full references given in Robertson, et al.  
 57 2016). The ongoing ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) eradication from Europe (Robertson, et  
 58 al., 2015) covers six states totalling 1,535,509 km<sup>2</sup>.

59 Data on the costs of eradications are available for projects covering ten orders of magnitude  
 60 of scale. Studies have described the costs of successful mammal eradications from islands  
 61 (Martins, et al., 2006; Howald, et al., 2007) and larger land-masses (Robertson, et al., 2017),  
 62 while Rejmanek & Pitcairn (2002) describe costed plant eradications in California. For  
 63 mammal eradications, those on large land-masses covered significantly larger areas than

those reported from islands while successful plant eradication were confined to smaller areas. Data from these different sources, appear to follow the same relationship (Fig. 1) whereby the cost per unit area is reduced by approximately 10% as the area involved doubles (Robertson, et al., 2017). As experience of eradications on larger islands grows, the overlap between island and mainland experience is increasing (Cruz, et al., 2009; Parkes, et al., 2014; Piernney, et al., 2016).

It is worth recording that two small datasets describe programmes that fall outside this relationship. Rejmanek & Pitcairn (2002) also record three aquatic plant eradications which appeared more expensive than comparably sized terrestrial plant programmes, while the ruddy duck eradication (Robertson, et al., 2015) has been significantly less expensive compared to similarly scaled mammal programmes (Robertson, et al., 2017). More data is needed on the management of other taxa in different environments before firm conclusions can be drawn. These results are based upon currently available methods of eradication. As new technologies, such as gene-drives (Webber, et al., 2015), e-DNA self-resetting (Carter, et al., 2016) and self-reporting traps (Jones, et al., 2015) become available it is likely that these costs will decrease.

## **Eradication and Complete Removal**

In their classic paper, Bomford & O'Brien (1995) make a clear distinction between eradication and on-going control, presenting these as alternative objectives for management. They also identify three key criteria for successful eradication; that the rate of removal exceeds the rate of increase at all densities; there is no immigration; and all reproductive animals are at risk.

These definitions and criteria have guided many successful eradications, and are particularly applicable to islands where the population extent and risks of immigration can be readily assessed. However, at the scales found on larger land masses, these criteria may be more difficult to apply or achieve, for example where the boundaries of a population remain poorly defined, where multiple population centres may occur on the same land mass, or where immigration remains a risk. Despite this, large scale programmes frequently lead to the removal of species from large areas of land. While not meeting Bomford & O'Brien's (1995) definition of eradication, these situations are also not well described as on-going control as no active management is required across the majority of the area. In these circumstances

‘complete removal’ may be a better definition of the objectives, sitting between Bomford & O’Brien’s (1995) definitions of eradication and on-going control.

- **Eradication**, the complete removal from an area, with no immediate prospect of recolonisation from neighbouring areas.

- **Complete Removal** from an area but with ongoing effort to maintain the area as clear.

- **On-going Control** within an area to reduce abundance, associated damage and the risk of spread.

Based on this definition, complete removal has been applied in a number of forms.

## 1 - Complete removal to a boundary

One objective of large scale programmes can include complete removal of a species up to a boundary across which the risk of reinvasion remains. Control along the boundary, or in a neighbouring buffer zone, can reduce the risk of reinvasion and help keep the main area clear. The nature of the boundary may vary, including fences (Saunders & Norton, 2001), landscape barriers such as water bodies or mountains (Schuchert, et al., 2014), or bottlenecks through which invading animals must move (Roy, et al., 2015). These boundaries can be permanent features of the management, requiring ongoing inputs (Saunders & Norton, 2001), or may be part of a phased programme to clear a larger area (Yamada & Sugimura, 2004; Bryce, et al., 2011; Robertson, et al., 2015; Russell, et al., 2015). If the aim is the removal of the species from a large area, but the funds or resources are insufficient for the simultaneous management of the entire population, then removal to a boundary is likely to feature.

The North American ruddy duck was introduced to the UK in the late 1940s, its subsequent spread into Europe threatens the native white-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephalus*) through hybridisation. The plan to eradicate the ruddy duck from Europe involves coordinated management across the continent. As the UK was the original source of this population and contained the majority of the birds, it was the focus of initial control (Robertson, et al., 2015). However, once the UK no longer contained breeding birds (currently it is thought only a few males remain), the English Channel became a boundary between a cleared area and the remaining continental populations. Control of the remaining European birds is ongoing, in the meantime the UK maintains surveillance and, if required, control along this boundary to maintain its cleared status.

In the UK, the native red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) is threatened by the ongoing spread of the invasive grey squirrel (*S. carolinensis*). This is mediated by the spread of a poxvirus by the asymptomatic greys which is typically fatal to the reds (Rushton, et al., 2000). The island of Anglesey on the north coast of Wales contained a small relict population of the native reds although greys were spreading onto the island. A control programme removed the greys (Schuchert, et al., 2014), allowing the reds to spread and recolonise the entire island. Anglesey is separated from mainland Wales by a narrow tidal channel, crossed by two bridges. There is evidence that grey squirrels can cross this boundary and the risk of recolonisation remains. To reduce this risk and maintain the island as grey squirrel free, management has included a surveillance and rapid response programme to pick up incursions (Shuttleworth, et al., 2016), trapping to reduce the density of greys on the mainland side of the boundary, and a plan to extend the area of complete removal to clear greys from the North Wales coast up to a more distant boundary formed by a geographic bottleneck where the mountains meet the coast.

The American mink (*Neovison vison*) spread through the Western Isles of Scotland following its escape from fur farms in the 1950s. Its spread threatened internationally important populations of ground nesting birds as well as local economic activities such as salmon fishing. The decision was taken to aim for the eradication of this species from the archipelago, but logistic and funding constraints combined with the need to gain experience, led to a phased programme. In the first phase, mink were completely removed from the Uists, the southernmost islands of the chain (Roy, et al., 2015; Faulkner, et al., 2017). A buffer zone was maintained (South Harris) between this cleared area and the remaining mink population on the main island (Lewis) to the north. This buffer included a narrow, island strewn channel between the Uists and South Harris. Trapping on these ‘stepping stone’ islands together with South Harris itself provided an effective barrier to recolonisation. Once the Uists work had provided confidence that eradication was feasible, a second phase extended mink control north to cover the remainder of the archipelago (Lambin, et al., 2014).

## **2 - Complete removal from patches**

In some cases the primary objective of management may be the reduction of the impact of an invasive species with no prospect to eradicate. In many cases this constitutes ongoing control rather than complete removal (Bomford & O’Brien, 1995), although in some circumstances it

can lead to complete removal. For this to occur, two criteria must be met, the species must be controlled at a rate sufficient to remove all of the resident animals in an area, and the scale of control should be such that the risk of recolonisation is so low in the centre of the controlled area that the central area is effectively maintained clear. The prospects of this occurring are scale dependent, with the cleared area forming a larger proportion of the total as scale increases.

This approach has been used in New Zealand with the creation of ‘mainland islands’, areas maintained predator free through the use of fencing combined with continuing control (Saunders & Norton 2001; Gillies, et al., 2003). The same results can be achieved without fencing, for example in Mauritius where the introduced small Asian mongoose (*Urva auropunctata*) (Patou, et al., 2009) is a major threat to the continued survival of a range of native bird species (Bunbury, et al., 2008). The mongoose is widely spread across the island, inhabiting a range of habitats, while the native birds are largely confined to remaining patches of good quality native forest. Control of the mongoose has been carried out in a number of these forest areas to create ‘mongoose free’ patches within the wider mongoose distribution. A network of box traps has been in place since 1989 and maintain a year round effort to remove mongoose. As the size of the trapped area increases, the number of animals captured per unit area decreases (Fig. 2). Areas less than 5 km in extent continue to catch high numbers of mongoose per unit area, presumably because they face a constant recolonisation pressure from neighbouring habitats. However, in larger areas, particularly those over 10 km<sup>2</sup> in area, mongoose catch per unit area drops dramatically. This is consistent with trapping catching animals in a boundary area, with the proportion of the area maintained as mongoose free increasing as the total area trapped increases. Achieving this requires an ongoing effort, but complete removal provides many of the benefits of eradication, and has been a key element of efforts to conserve a suite of species endemic to the island. These include the Mauritius kestrel (*Falco punctatus*), the pink pigeon (*Nesoenas mayeri*), the echo parakeet (*Psittacula eques*) and a number of passerines such as the Mauritius black bird (*Hypsepetes olivaceous*), and Mauritius fody (*Foudia rubra*). Only through intensive trapping to maintain these predator-free patches, combined with a captive breeding and release programme, disease management and supplementary feeding, have these species managed to persist.

### 3 – Complete removal from habitat islands

Islands as blocks of land surrounded by water are widely recognised, but isolated blocks of habitat within a matrix of other land uses share many of the same characteristics. When invasive alien species are confined to discrete habitats within this matrix, they can be considered as inhabiting ‘habitat islands’. In these cases, limited rates of species movement or colonisation between habitat islands may produce isolated populations, with particular opportunities for management within large land masses.

The monk parakeet (*Myiopsitta monachus*), has established a number of discrete populations in different European cities (Munoz & Real, 2006; Rodriguez-Pastor, et al., 2012). Although an attractive species widely kept as a pet, in the wild this species builds large communal nests on tall trees or man-made structures such as electricity infrastructure or radio masts. The large size and volume of nest material can lead to electrical short-outs and fire risks, with consequent economic costs (Avery, et al., 2002). The discrete nature of its current distribution, with isolated populations including London, Amsterdam and a variety of Spanish cities suggests that different populations have derived from separate releases rather than natural spread from a single point of release. The management of this species reflects this, with some regions attempting the complete removal of isolated populations (Parrott, 2013).

The introduced Pallas’ squirrel (*Callosciurus erythraeus*) also has a highly fragmented distribution within Europe, suggesting a number of separate introductions rather than spread from a single point of release. A rapid response in Flanders, Belgium removed a population whose distribution was constrained to a suburban setting in a small community surrounded by farmland (Adriaens, et al., 2015). In effect this species was present on a habitat island which aided its removal.

The current removal of rats from South Georgia (Piernney, et al., 2016) uses a similar approach. Glaciers on the island separate a number of discrete rat populations, which appear to be genetically isolated (Robertson & Gemmell, 2004). This allows the complete removal of discrete populations as steps to achieve the larger goal of island wide eradication.

These examples illustrate the potential for effective removal of isolated populations to be undertaken within larger land masses, using the principles applied to island eradications. However, as species establish and spread these discrete populations will become less pronounced. Identifying whether the distribution of a species represents a number of discrete clusters will have important implications for management, for example the decision to



consider complete removal or on-going control. Spatial analysis of distributional data can be used to indicate the presence of discrete populations of a species. A range of spatial and spatio-temporal clustering algorithms (Velazquez, et al., 2016) can detect spatial point patterns and may be useful to differentiate clusters as they form.

## **Effectiveness and scale**

We used published accounts to assess the costs of removal at different scales. Doing so requires dealing with a number of biases. Firstly, it is commonly recognised that the published literature preferentially records success (Dwan, et al., 2008). For example, the successful coypu eradication in the UK is well documented (Gosling & Baker, 1987; Baker & Clarke, 1988; Gosling, et al., 1988; Gosling & Baker, 1989; Baker, 2006); the failed UK attempt to eradicate the American mink is barely recorded (Sheail, 2004) although it took place on a similar scale. Other failures are likely to have gone unrecorded. A publicly available database of island eradications is available (Keitt, et al., 2011), it would be useful to extend this to also include details of eradications on larger land masses. More importantly, the literature only records attempts, there is very little information on those situations where no action was taken, either through inaction or a judgement that it was not worthwhile. Inaction remains the most common response to invasive species. The successful island eradications are based on only a tiny proportion of the world islands, while the number of attempted eradications of alien species in Europe (Genovesi, 2005) is a similarly small proportion of the 20,000 species thought to have established.

If we are to make more objective decisions, we need to decide if and when management is appropriate in both island and mainland situations. Prioritisation methods have been applied to islands to identify those where management may be most beneficial (Harris, et al., 2012; Dawson, et al., 2015). Booy, et al. 2017 describe a method to assess the feasibility of eradication which incorporates the consideration of scale. If, as seems likely but has yet to be convincingly demonstrated, the prospects for successful eradication or complete removal decrease as a species spreads, then these methods offer a route to assess at what scale eradication or complete removal may no longer be a realistic outcome.

The application of methods to assess the feasibility of management is a critical need. The current EU invasive alien species regulations include the listing of species considered to be of ‘Union Concern’ and place reporting and management obligations on member states in which

they occur. The selection of species for listing is largely based on established methods of risk assessment (Roy, et al., 2014), identifying species which pose a risk without similarly considering the feasibility of management. This focus on risk can result in the listing of species for which there are few realistic prospects for management. For example, of the 79 species currently listed or under consideration as Species of Union Concern, over half are already present in at least five member states. To date there are no successful examples of species eradication or complete removal in Europe when a species has already spread to this number of countries, although these may occur in future. Listing species based on risk assessment alone, without considering the scale and feasibility of management, risks committing resources into the on-going management of already widespread species, rather than the more productive routes of prevention and rapid response.

## **Conclusions**

The experience of island eradications continues to grow, and to be applied at increasing scales. Alongside this, new legislation will drive increasing management on larger land masses. As island eradications grow in scale they will face many of the challenges experienced on larger land-masses, such as problems defining populations, multiple population centres on the same land mass, ongoing risks of immigration and the need for interim objectives. We suggest the term ‘complete removal’ to reflect the situation regularly encountered on larger land masses where a species may be removed from an area but with the need for an ongoing effort to maintain the area clear given the risk of reinvasion. The literature contains examples of successful eradications or complete removals in island and mainland situations covering 10 orders of magnitude. These island and mainland programmes appear to follow the same cost-area relationship. They also demonstrate an advantage of scale, with the costs per unit area of control reduced as the area of control increases. On larger land masses, such as the EU, care is needed to focus species listing on species where prevention, eradication or complete removal are realistic outcomes rather than committing member states to the on-going control of already widespread species. Methods of prioritisation which balance both risk and the feasibility of management, including the effects of scale on cost and effectiveness, are needed to guide future actions.

## **References**

289 Adriaens, T., Baert, K., Breyne, P., Casaer, J., Devisscher, S., Onkelinx, T., Pieters, S. and  
 290 Stuyck, J. (2015). 'Successful eradication of a suburban Pallas's squirrel *Callosciurus*  
 291 *erythraeus* (Pallas 1779) (Rodentia, Sciuridae) population in Flanders (northern Belgium)'.  
 292 *Biological Invasions* 17(9): 2517-2526.

293 Avery, M.L., Greiner, E.C., Lindsay, J.R., Newman, J.R. and Pruett-Jones, S. (2002). 'Monk  
 294 parakeet management at electric utility facilities in south Florida'. Proceedings 20th  
 295 Vertebrate Pest Conference: 140-145. University of California, Davis.

296 Baker, S.J. and Clarke, C.N. (1988). 'Cage trapping coypus (*Myocastor coypus*) on baited  
 297 rafts'. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 25: 41-48.

298 Baker, S. (2006). 'The eradication of coypus (*Myocastor coypus*) from Britain: the elements  
 299 required for a successful campaign'. *Assessment and Control of Biological Invasion Risks*,  
 300 pp.142-147. Kyoto, Japan: Shoukadoh Book Sellers and Gland, Switzerland:IUCN.

301 Bomford, M. and O'Brien, P. (1995). 'Eradication or control for vertebrate pests?' *Wildlife*  
 302 *Society Bulletin* 23: 249-255.

303 Booy, O., Mill, A.C., Roy, H.E., Hiley, A., Moore, N., Robertson, P., Baker, S., Brazier, M.,  
 304 Bue, M., Bullock, R. and Campbell, S. (2017) 'Risk management to prioritise the eradication  
 305 of new and emerging invasive non-native species'. *Biological Invasions*, 19(8): 2401-2417.  
 306 doi:10.1007/s10530-017-1451-z

307 Bunbury, N., Stidworthy, M.F., Greenwood, A.G., Jones, C.G., Sawmy, S., Cole, R.E.,  
 308 Edmunds, K. and Bell, D.J., (2008). 'Causes of mortality in free-living Mauritian pink  
 309 pigeons *Columba mayeri*, 2002–2006'. *Endangered Species Research* 9(3): 213-220.

310 Bryce, R., Oliver, M.K., Davies, L., Gray, H., Urquhart, J. and Lambin, X., (2011). 'Turning  
 311 back the tide of American mink invasion at an unprecedented scale through community  
 312 participation and adaptive management'. *Biological Conservation* 144(1): 575-583.

313 Carter, A., Barr, S., Bond, C., Paske, G., Peters, D. and van Dam, R. (2016). 'Controlling  
 314 sympatric pest mammal populations in New Zealand with self-resetting, toxicant-free traps: a  
 315 promising tool for invasive species management'. *Biological Invasions* 18(6): 1723.

316 Cruz, F., Carrion, V., Campbell, K.J., Lavoie, C. and Donlan, C.J. (2009). 'Bio-economics of  
 317 large-scale eradication of feral goats from Santiago Island, Galápagos'. *Journal of Wildlife*  
 318 *Management* 73(2): 191-200.

319 Dawson, J., Oppel, S., Cuthbert, R.J., Holmes, N., Bird, J.P., Butchart, S.H., Spatz, D.R. and  
 320 Tershy, B. (2015). 'Prioritizing islands for the eradication of invasive vertebrates in the  
 321 United Kingdom overseas territories'. *Conservation Biology* 29(1): 143-153.

322 Dwan, K., Altman, D.G., Arnaiz, J.A., Bloom, J., Chan, A.W., Cronin, E., Decullier, E.,  
 323 Easterbrook, P.J., Von Elm, E., Gamble, C. and Gherzi, D. (2008). 'Systematic review of the  
 324 empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias'. *PloS One*, 3(8),  
 325 p.e3081.

326 Faulkner, S.C., Verity, R., Roberts, D., Roy, S.S., Robertson, P.A., Stevenson, M.D. and Le  
 327 Comber, S.C. (2017). 'Using geographic profiling to compare the value of sightings vs trap  
 328 data in a biological invasion.' *Diversity and Distributions* 23(1): 104-112.

329 Genovesi, P., (2005). 'Eradications of invasive alien species in Europe: a review'. *Issues in*  
 330 *Bioinvasion Science* 7: 127-133

331 Gillies, C.A., Leach, M.R., Coad, N.B., Theobald, S.W., Campbell, J., Herbert, T., Graham,  
 332 P.J. and Pierce, R.J. (2003). 'Six years of intensive pest mammal control at Trounson Kauri  
 333 Park, a Department of Conservation "mainland island", June 1996—July 2002'. *New Zealand*  
 334 *Journal of Zoology* 30(4): 399-420.

335 Gosling, L.M. and Baker, S.J. (1987). 'Planning and monitoring an attempt to eradicate  
 336 coypus from Britain'. *Symposia of the Zoological Society of London* 58: 99-113).

337 Gosling, L.M., Baker, S.J. and Clarke, C.N. (1988). 'An attempt to remove coypus  
 338 (*Myocastor coypus*) from a wetland habitat in East Anglia'. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 25:  
 339 49-62.

340 Gosling, L.M. and Baker, S.J. (1989). 'The eradication of muskrats and coypus from Britain.'  
 341 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 38(1): 39-51.

342 Harris, D.B., Gregory, S.D., Bull, L.S. and Courchamp, F. (2012). 'Island prioritization for  
 343 invasive rodent eradications with an emphasis on reinvasion risk'. *Biological Invasions*  
 344 14(6): 1251-1263.

345 Howald, G., Donlan, C., Galván, J.P., Russell, J.C., Parkes, J., Samaniego, A., Wang, Y.,  
 346 Veitch, D., Genovesi, P., Pascal, M. and Saunders, A. (2007). 'Invasive rodent eradication on  
 347 islands'. *Conservation Biology* 21(5): 1258-1268.

348 Jones, C., Warburton, B., Carver, J. and Carver, D. (2015). 'Potential applications of wireless  
349 sensor networks for wildlife trapping and monitoring programs'. *Wildlife Society*  
350 *Bulletin* 39(2): 341-348.

351 Keitt, B., Campbell, K., Saunders, A., Clout, M., Wang, Y., Heinz, R., Newton, K. and  
352 Tershy, B., 2011. The global islands invasive vertebrate eradication database: a tool to  
353 improve and facilitate restoration of island ecosystems. In: C.R. Veitch, M.N. Clout and D.R.  
354 Towns (eds.) *Island Invasives: Eradication and Management*, pp. 74-77. Auckland: CBB and  
355 Gland: IUCN.

356 Lambin, X.L., Cornulier, T., Oliver, M.K. and Fraser, E.J. (2014) 'Analysis and future  
357 application of Hebridean Mink Project data'. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report  
358 No. 522

359 Martins, T.L.F., Brooke, M.D.L., Hilton, G.M., Farnsworth, S., Gould, J. and Pain, D.J.  
360 (2006). 'Costing eradications of alien mammals from islands'. *Animal Conservation* 9(4):  
361 439-444.

362 Muñoz, A.R. and Real, R. (2006). 'Assessing the potential range expansion of the exotic  
363 monk parakeet in Spain'. *Diversity and Distributions* 12(6): 656-665

364 Parkes, J., Fisher, P., Robinson, S. and Aguirre-Muñoz, A., (2014). 'Eradication of feral cats  
365 from large islands: an assessment of the effort required for success'. *New Zealand Journal of*  
366 *Ecology* 38: 307-314.

367 Parrott, D. (2013) 'Monk parakeet control in London'. In: C. van Ham, P. Genovesi and R.  
368 Scalera (eds.) *Invasive alien species: the urban dimension*, pp 83-85. Gland, Switzerland:  
369 IUCN.

370 Patou, M. L., Mclenachan, P. A., Morley, C. G., Couloux, A., Jennings, A. P. and Veron, G.  
371 (2009). 'Molecular phylogeny of the Herpestidae (Mammalia, Carnivora) with a special  
372 emphasis on the Asian Herpestes'. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 53(1): 69-80.

373 Piertney, S.B., Black, A., Watt, L., Christie, D., Poncet, S. and Collins, M.A. (2016).  
374 'Resolving patterns of population genetic and phylogeographic structure to inform control  
375 and eradication initiatives for brown rats *Rattus norvegicus* on South Georgia'. *Journal of*  
376 *Applied Ecology* 53: 332-339.

377 Rejmánek, M. and Pitcairn, M.J. (2002). 'When is eradication of exotic pest plants a realistic  
378 goal.' In: C.R. Veitch and M.N. Clout (eds.) *Turning the Tide: The Eradication of Invasive*  
379 *Species*, pp. 249-253. Gland: IUCN.

380 Robertson, B.C. and Gemmell, N.J. (2004). 'Defining eradication units to control invasive  
381 pests'. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41(6): 1042-1048.

382 Robertson, P.A., Adriaens, T., Caizergues, A., Cranswick, P.A., Devos, K., Gutiérrez-  
383 Expósito, C., Henderson, I., Hughes, B., Mill, A.C. and Smith, G.C. (2015). 'Towards the  
384 European eradication of the North American ruddy duck.' *Biological Invasions* 17(1): 9-12.

385 Robertson, P.A., Adriaens, T., Lambin, X., Mill, A., Roy, S., Shuttleworth, C.M. and  
386 Sutton- Croft, M. (2017). 'The large- scale removal of mammalian invasive alien species in  
387 Northern Europe'. *Pest Management Science* 73(2): 273-279.

388 Rodríguez-Pastor, R., Senar, J.C., Ortega, A., Faus, J., Uribe, F. and Montalvo, T. (2012).  
389 'Distribution patterns of invasive Monk parakeets (*Myiopsitta monachus*) in an urban  
390 habitat.' *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation* 35(1): 107-117.

391 Roy, H., Schonrogge, K., Dean, H., Peyton, J., Branquart, E., Vanderhoeven, S., Copp, G.,  
392 Stebbing, P., Kenis, M., Rabitsch, W. and Essl, F. (2014). 'Invasive alien species–framework  
393 for the identification of invasive alien species of EU concern'. Report to the European  
394 Commission ENV.B.2/ETU/2013/0026.

395 Roy, S.S., Chauvenet, A.L.M. and Robertson, P.A., (2015). 'Removal of American mink  
396 (*Neovison vison*) from the Uists, Outer Hebrides, Scotland'. *Biological Invasions* 17(10):  
397 2811-2820.

398 Rushton, S.P., Lurz, P.W.W., Gurnell, J. and Fuller, R. (2000). 'Modelling the spatial  
399 dynamics of parapoxvirus disease in red and grey squirrels: a possible cause of the decline in  
400 the red squirrel in the UK?' *Journal of Applied Ecology* 37(6): 997-1012.

401 Russell, J.C., Innes, J.G., Brown, P.H. and Byrom, A.E. (2015). 'Predator-free New Zealand:  
402 conservation country'. *BioScience* 65(5): 520-525.

403 Saunders, A. and Norton, D.A. (2001). 'Ecological restoration at mainland islands in New  
404 Zealand'. *Biological Conservation* 99(1): 109-119.

405 Schuchert, P., Shuttleworth, C.M., McInnes, C.J., Everest, D.J. and Rushton, S.P. (2014).  
406 'Landscape scale impacts of culling upon a European grey squirrel population: can trapping

407 reduce population size and decrease the threat of squirrelpox virus infection for the native red  
408 squirrel?’ *Biological invasions* 16(11): 2381.

409 Shuttleworth, C, Robertson, P. and Halliwell, L. (2016). ‘Identifying incursion pathways,  
410 early detection responses and management actions to prevent grey squirrel range expansion:  
411 an island case study in Wales.’ In: C.M. Shuttleworth, P.W.W. Lurz and J. Gurnell (eds.) *The*  
412 *Grey Squirrel: Ecology and Management of an Invasive Species in Europe*. pp 475-495. UK:  
413 European Squirrel Initiative.

414 Sheail, J. (2004). ‘The mink menace: the politics of vertebrate pest control’. *Rural History*  
415 15(02): 207-222.

416 Velázquez, E., Martínez, I., Getzin, S., Moloney, K.A. and Wiegand, T. (2016). ‘An  
417 evaluation of the state of spatial point pattern analysis in ecology’. *Ecography* 39(11): 1042-  
418 1055.

419 Webber, B.L., Raghu, S. and Edwards, O.R. (2015). ‘Opinion: Is CRISPR-based gene drive a  
420 biocontrol silver bullet or global conservation threat?’ *Proceedings of the National Academy*  
421 *of Sciences* 112(34): 10565-10567.

422 Yamada, F. and Sugimura, K. (2004). ‘Negative impact of an invasive small Indian  
423 mongoose *Herpestes javanicus* on native wildlife species and evaluation of a control project  
424 in Amami-Oshima and Okinawa Islands, Japan’. *Global Environmental Research* 8(2): 117-  
425 124.

426




Fig. 1 The relationship between the area ( $\text{km}^2$ ) of a successful removal and the total cost (US\$). The square symbols represent island mammal eradications reported by Martins, et al., (2006). The circles are for removals of mammals from larger land masses in Northern Europe (Robertson, et al., 2016). The three diamond symbols are recent examples or predictions of large-scale mammal eradications from islands: (Cruz, et al., 2009; Parkes, et al., 2014; Pierny, 2016). Plant eradications from California are triangles (Rejmanek & Pitcairn, 2002). Where the study recorded effort as man-years or man-days, total cost is estimated based on US\$50k per man-year (Rejmanek & Pitcairn, 2002; Parkes, et al., 2014; Robertson, et al., 2016).




Fig. 2 The density of mongoose removed by trapping in five conservation areas in Mauritius. The control areas were surrounded by habitat containing mongoose populations.